

## REMARKS

### Summary of Office Action

Claims 23-62 were pending in the application.

In the Office Action, the specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter for claims 47-54 and 61-62.

Claims 23-62 were rejected in the office action on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 and 19-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,742,183.

### Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants have canceled claims 47-54 and 61-62. Claims 23-46 and 55-60 remain pending in the application.

In response to the nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection, applicants submit herewith a terminal disclaimer over U.S. Patent No. 6,742,183.

### Reply to Objection

Although it is believed that the specification description of embodiments of the invention provides adequate basis for ascertaining the meaning of the terms in the claims as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.75, claims 47-54 and 61-62 are canceled to advance prosecution of the application. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the canceled claims in a continuing application. Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.


Reply to Double Patenting Rejection

To advance prosecution of the application, a terminal disclaimer over U.S. Patent No. 6,742,183 is submitted herewith in response to the nonstatutory double patenting rejection in the Office Action. Withdrawal of the double patenting rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 23-46 and 55-60 are allowable. Reconsideration and allowance are accordingly respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Pristine Johannessen  
Reg. No. 55,302  
Attorney for Applicants  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
Customer No. 77563  
1211 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-8704  
Tel.: (212) 596-9000  
Fax: (212) 596-9090